

RASTER CHART DISPLAY SYSTEM FIELD TEST

IDENTIFICATION INFORMATION

| Name of Vessel Type, Tons, Length Company Name Contact Name Address | MARULAND PILOES |
|---|---|
| Telephone E-Mail | |
| RASTER CHART I | EQUIPMENT IN USE DURING TEST |
| Navigation Software Version Manufacturer Computer Monitor Size Monitor Resolution Raster Data Brand | MARINER 2.04 INSOLAN TOSHIDO MODEL 610 10" 400 x 600 NOBR |
| Indicate (V/N) as to | ENT IN USE DURING TEST whether the equipment is integrated with the raster chart navigation cate the manufacturer and model. |
| GPS (Y/N) DGPS (Y/N) Radar (Y/N) ARPA (Y/N) LORAN C (Y/N) Speed Log (Y/N) Compass (Y/N) Other (Y/N) | Yes -STAPLINK - No |

| erator's Name erator's Rank | PILOT | | |
|---|--|---|--|
| OS Experience | 4 VEARS | | |
| | | | |
| ars Experience a | helmsman _ | | |
| | navigation/chart work | | |
| | officer of the watch | 4YEARS | |
| _ | Captain/Master of a vessel | | |
| | pilot - | 24 UEAKS | |
| | other (specify) | | |
| EST AREA | | | |
| | routes or general geograph | nic area where the RCDS | was being used a |
| escribe the main /aluated: | RAY 150 miles | | |
| ChesapEAK | e Bay 150 miles | Someto Che | wee. |
| | / | | |
| C+D CAN | 41 all cham | nels | |
| | | | |
| | ENVIRONMENT | nce being reflected in this | s test report, the |
| | centage of the total experience RCDS was being used in | nce being reflected in this the following situations. | |
| Estimate as a perc smount of time th | centage of the total experience RCDS was being used in | the following situations. | 10 |
| Estimate as a pero mount of time the | centage of the total experience RCDS was being used in | * Heavy Traffic | |
| Estimate as a percumount of time the open Water Pass Coastal Transit | centage of the total experience RCDS was being used in | * Heavy Traffic Medium Traffic | 10 |
| Estimate as a peromount of time the Open Water Pass Coastal Transit | centage of the total experience RCDS was being used in age | * Heavy Traffic | 10 40 50 |
| Estimate as a perdumount of time the Open Water Pass Coastal Transit Harbor & Approachannels/Constri | centage of the total experience RCDS was being used in age | * Heavy Traffic Medium Traffic | 10 40 50 total 100% |
| Estimate as a percumount of time the open Water Pass Coastal Transit Harbor & Approachannels/Constrict Constrict Con | centage of the total experience RCDS was being used in age ach icted 3 | * Heavy Traffic Medium Traffic Light or No Traffic | 10 40 50 total 100% |
| Estimate as a peromount of time the open Water Pass Coastal Transit Harbor & Approachannels/Constrict Cocking | centage of the total experience RCDS was being used in age ach icted | Heavy Traffic Medium Traffic Light or No Traffic Day Navigation | 10 40 50 total 100% |
| Estimate as a peromount of time the Open Water Pass Coastal Transit Harbor & Approachannels/Constrict Cocking | centage of the total experience RCDS was being used in age ach icted 3 | * Heavy Traffic Medium Traffic Light or No Traffic | 10 40 50 total 100% |
| Estimate as a pere- mount of time the constant of the constant | centage of the total experience RCDS was being used in age ach | Heavy Traffic Medium Traffic Light or No Traffic Day Navigation Night Navigation | 10 40 50 total 100% 40 |
| Estimate as a peromount of time the open Water Pass Coastal Transit Harbor & Approximately Constrict Const | centage of the total experience RCDS was being used in age ach | Heavy Traffic Medium Traffic Light or No Traffic Day Navigation Night Navigation Quiet Seas | 10 40 50 total 100% 40 60 total 100% |
| Estimate as a percumount of time the constant of time the constant of time the constant of the | centage of the total experience RCDS was being used in age ach | Heavy Traffic Medium Traffic Light or No Traffic Day Navigation Night Navigation Quiet Seas Light Seas | 10 40 50 total 100% 40 60 total 100% |
| Estimate as a percumount of time the constant of time the constant of time the constant of the | centage of the total experience RCDS was being used in age ach | Heavy Traffic Medium Traffic Light or No Traffic Day Navigation Night Navigation Quiet Seas Light Seas Moderate Seas | 10 40 50 total 100% 40 60 total 100% |
| Estimate as a percumount of time the constant of time the constant of time the constant of the | centage of the total experience RCDS was being used in age ach So total 100% lity 30 30 10 | Heavy Traffic Medium Traffic Light or No Traffic Day Navigation Night Navigation Quiet Seas Light Seas | 10 40 50 total 100% 40 60 total 100% 20 75 |
| Estimate as a percumount of time the constant of time the constant of time the constant of the | centage of the total experience RCDS was being used in age ach | Heavy Traffic Medium Traffic Light or No Traffic Day Navigation Night Navigation Quiet Seas Light Seas Moderate Seas | 10 40 50 total 100% 40 60 total 100% |
| Estimate as a percamount of time the amount of time the Open Water Pass Coastal Transit Harbor & Approach Channels/Construction of the Channels (Specify) Excellent Visibility Poor Visibility No Visibility | centage of the total experience RCDS was being used in age age output total 100% lity 30 total 100% | Heavy Traffic Medium Traffic Light or No Traffic Day Navigation Night Navigation Quiet Seas Light Seas Moderate Seas | 10 40 50 total 100% 40 60 total 100% 20 75 |
| Estimate as a percumount of time the commount of time the constant of the cons | centage of the total experience RCDS was being used in age ach | Heavy Traffic Medium Traffic Light or No Traffic Day Navigation Night Navigation Quiet Seas Light Seas Moderate Seas Heavy Seas | 10 40 50 total 100% 40 60 total 100% 20 75 0 total 100% |
| Estimate as a percamount of time the Approximate Channels/Construction Channels/Construc | centage of the total experience RCDS was being used in age ach icted total 100% output total 100% output total 100% output total 100% output total 100% | Heavy Traffic Medium Traffic Light or No Traffic Day Navigation Night Navigation Quiet Seas Light Seas Moderate Seas Heavy Seas | 10 40 50 total 100% 40 60 total 100% 20 75 5 0 total 100% |

EVALUATION SCALE (use for all questions)

| | | THE STREET | | | |
|-------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|
| | | Section 1 | | | |
| does not apply | much worse than paper chart | somewhat werse | comparable to paper chart | somewhat better | superior to paper chart |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| cannot comment | significant prob lem | misor problem | no problem | minor advantage | significant advantage |
| COMMENT | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| jid not observe | hard to use | moderately difficult use | Adequate ease of mat | moderately easy to use | easy to use |
| • | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| did not use | inadequate | marginal | acceptable | good | excellent |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | . 3 |

EVALUATION SCALE (use for all questions)

1. RCDS AS A VOYAGE PLANNING TOOL

If using an RCDS for voyage planning is about the same as using a paper chart, then score the item in the middle of the range at "3".

| Ref | Scores | Questions |
|------|------------|--|
| # | (1-5 or 0) | (compared to paper chart performance where appropriate) |
| | | How would you evaluate doing the following navigation functions |
| | | with a raster chart compared to doing the comparable functions on |
| | | a paper chart? |
| 1.1 | 5 | - entering routes, the adequacy of the number that could be entered? |
| 1.2 | 5 | - entering waypoints and if an adequate number were allowed? |
| 1.3 | | - adding waypoints to a route after entering or reloading it? |
| 1.4 | 7 | - deleting waypoints from a route? |
| 1.5 | - | - changing the position of a waypoint? |
| 1.6 | 7 | - changing the order of waypoints in a route? |
| 1.7 | 3 | - entering an adequate number of alternative routes? |
| 1.8 | 3 | - distinguishing alternate routes from the principal one? |
| 1.9 | ~ | - displaying routes over other charts? |
| 1.10 | - | - reloading previously planned routes for further planning? |
| 1.11 | 3 | - dropping or inserting waypoints in real-time as you went? |
| 1.12 | 3 | - loading load tracks actually sailed for use in planning? |
| 1,13 | 4 | - specifying a cross-track error to trigger an automatic alarm? |
| 1.14 | 4 | - entering and annotating marks (operator-entered points)? |
| 1.15 | 5 | - editing and/or deleting marks? |
| 1.16 | | - entering points, lines or areas which would activate an alarm such |
| •••• | 4 | as guard zones, boundaries, range circles, etc.? |
| 1.17 | 3 | - entering notes that you wanted to enter? |
| 1.18 | 5 | - preparing a printed a voyage plan, a get home chartlet, GPS |
| |) | waypoints? |

| | | Remember, you are to evaluate doing the following navigation |
|------|----|---|
| | | functions using a raster chart compared to doing the comparable |
| - | | functions on a paper chart. |
| 1.19 | 5_ | - calculate the distance of your planned trip? |
| 1.20 | 3 | - calculate bearing and distance to waypoints? |
| 1.21 | 3 | - estimate transit time(s)? |
| 1.22 | 5 | - recalculate time along track if you moved waypoints? |
| 1.23 | 5- | - readily display all the charts you needed? |
| 1.24 | 5 | - move around the chart (pan and zoom) while planning? |
| 1.25 | 5 | - display previously entered data over any chart you wanted? |
| 1.26 | | - make the planning assessments and judgements that you would |
| | 5 | make with a paper chart? |
| 1.27 | 4 | How was the planning workload compared to a paper chart? |
| | | Score the following questions without comparing to a paper chart. |
| 1,28 | 4 | How was the legibility of the chart image during your planning session? |
| 1.29 | 4 | How was the impact on planning of seeing only a portion of a chart on |
| | 7 | the screen at one time? |
| 1.30 | 4 | How was the impact of chart notes not always being visible? |
| 1.31 | 0 | How was the impact of some charts being on different map projections? |
| 1.32 | | How would you compare planning using a raster chart system with |
| | | planning using manual means and a paper chart? |
| 1.33 | 7 | Were there any fundamental limitations to planning using raster charts |
| | No | that were not just a limit of your software? What were they? |
| | | |
| | 1 | |
| | | |
| 1 | | |
| | | |
| | | · · |

2. RCDS FOR VOYAGE MONITORING

If using an RCDS for voyage monitoring is about the same as a paper chart, then score the item in the middle of the range at "3".

| Ref # | Scores (1-5 or 0) | Questions (compared to paper chart performance where appropriate) |
|----------|--------------------------|---|
| | | How would you evaluate doing the following navigation functions using a raster chart compared to doing the comparable functions on a paper chart? |
| 2.1 | 5 | - displaying clearly all chart and voyage monitoring information? |
| 2.2 | 3 | - add or remove mariner-added information? |
| 2.3 | 4 | - display, hide or query mariner-added information? |

| | T | Remember, you are to evaluate doing the following navigation |
|------|------------------|---|
| | ļ | functions using a raster chart compared to doing the comparable |
| | | functions on a paper chart. |
| .4 | 4 | - determine if a larger scale chart covers the area you are navigating? |
| .5 | - (-) | - distinguish the ship's track and mariner's notes on the image? |
| .6 | - | - showing your position accurately on the chart in real-time? |
| .7 | 4 | - performing dead reckoning if your positioning system failed? |
| _ | 4 | - displaying a planned route? |
| .8 | 4 | - displaying an alternate route in addition to the selected one? |
| .9 | | - distinguishing the alternative route from the selected one? |
| .10 | 4 | - modifying the selected route? |
| .11 | - 5 | - find and display any chart easily during voyage monitoring? |
| .12 | | - find and display any chart cashly during voyage monitor your voyage? |
| .13 | 3 | - move around the chart (pan and zoom) to monitor your voyage? |
| .14 | 4 | - look-ahead on the route during route monitoring? |
| .15 | 4 | - achieve an adequate overview of the voyage and route? |
| .16 | 5 | - transfer information you entered other charts? |
| 2.17 | 4 | - view chart notes which were located off-screen? |
| 2.18 | 5 | - create event marks at any time and annotate them? |
| 2.19 | .3 | - estimating of arrival time compared to a paper chart? |
| .20 | | - display the coordinates of any point on demand? |
| 2.21 | _ ~ | - enter coordinates and then display that position on demand? |
| 2,22 | | - determine your lat./long, at any time? |
| 2.23 | 5 | - dynamically measure range and bearing to charted objects? |
| 2.24 | | - monitor voyage parameters (speed over ground, course over |
| Z.Z. | 5 | ground, speed made good, time to go,)? |
| 2.25 | 5 | - switch from chart to chart manually in a convenient manner? |
| 2.23 | | John Maria |
| | | Score the following questions without comparing to a paper chart. |
| 200 | | The adequacy of the screen size? |
| 2.26 | | Screen "clutter" compared to a paper chart during voyage monitoring? |
| 2.27 | 3 | The night colors for comfortable and legible viewing? |
| 2.28 | <u>ي</u> | Did the ship and route automatically appear whenever the display |
| 2.29 | | |
| | | covered that area? |
| 2.30 | 5 | Did the chart automatically pan as the ship reached an appropriate |
| | | distance from the edge of the screen? |
| 2.31 | _ | View an area of the chart that did not contain the ship and have route |
| | 5 | monitoring/positioning continue in the background? |
| 2.32 | | By a single action, show chart scale, datum, and depth and height units |
| 2.33 | <u> </u> | Determine range and bearing to items that were off-screen? |
| 2.34 | 5 | Restore the ship-centered display with a single action? |
| 2.35 | 4 | Did waypoint arrival alarms work as you wished? |
| 2.36 | 4 | Did boundary crossing alarms work as you wished? |
| 2.37 | Nb | Were there frequent false alarms? |
| 2.38 | 1 | Did an alarm sound when you exceeded the cross track error limit? |

| | | Remember, you are scoring the following questions without comparison to a paper chart. |
|------|-----|---|
| 2.39 | 0 | Did an alarm sound if the ship, within a mariner-specified time or distance, was to reach a critical point on the planned route? |
| 2.40 | 3 | Did your system give an indication if positioning system input was lost? |
| 2.41 | 0 | If 2 positioning systems were used simultaneously, did the system identify discrepancies between the two? |
| 2.42 | - 3 | Was route monitoring carried out in a simple and reliable manner? |
| 2.43 | 5 | In restricted waterways, how was the RCDS as a voyage monitoring tool compared to the paper chart? |
| 2.44 | 5 | In congested waterway situations, how was the RCDS as a voyage monitoring tool compared to the paper chart? |
| 2.45 | 5 | Could time-labels along the ships track be displayed easily at a range of intervals between 1 and 120 minutes? |
| 2.46 | 3 | Were you always able to navigate north up? |
| 2.47 | 0 | If course-up navigation was offered, how was it compared to using a paper chart? |
| 2.48 | 5 | How would you compare voyage monitoring using a raster chart system with voyage monitoring using a paper chart? |
| 2.49 | 3 | How was the voyage monitoring workload compared to a paper chart? |
| 2.50 | 3 | How would you rate using RCDS as the primary means of navigation compared to paper charts? |
| 2.51 | 5 | How would you evaluate the impact on the safety of navigation when using an RCDS as opposed to a paper chart? |
| 2.52 | No | Are there circumstances where you would not use RCDS for voyage monitoring? When? |
| 2.53 | No | Were there any fundamental limitations to voyage monitoring with raster charts that were not just a limit of your software? What were they? |

3, RCDS FOR VOYAGE RECORDING

| Ref # | Scores (1-5 or 0) | Questions (compared to paper chart performance where appropriate) |
|----------|--------------------------|--|
| 3.1 | 5 | Could you record sufficient information to determine the ship's past track, time, position, heading and speed? |
| 3.2 | 5 | Were you able to add log entries manually? |
| 3.3 | 5 | Could you automatically record the official data used (RNC, edition, date and update history)? |
| 3.4 | 5 | Were you able to gather an adequate record of the voyage compared to using a paper chart? |
| 3.5 | 5 | Could you record the entire course made good with time marks at intervals not exceeding 4 hours? |
| 3.6 | 3 | Were you able to save at least the previous 12 hours of voyage track? |

4. OTHER

| Ref # | Scores (1-5 or 0) | Questions (compared to paper chart performance where appropriate) |
|----------|--------------------------|--|
| 4.1 | 5 | Were the accuracy of all calculations independent of the characteristics of the display and consistent with the RNC accuracy? |
| 4.2 | 5 | Were bearings and distances measured on the display as accurate as that afforded by the resolution of the display? |
| 4.3 | 5 | Could you make manual updates to the chart that were distinguishable from the original chart without affecting the legibility of the chart? |
| 4.4 | 01 | Did the RCDS degrade the performance of any equipment that was connected to it? |
| 4.5 | 5 | Once learned, how user-friendly would you judge the RCDS to be? |
| 4.6 | 0 | Did connection to other equipment degrade RCDS performance? |
| 4.7 | 5 | Did your system give adequate indication of system malfunction? |
| 4.8 | 4 | Were you able to execute in a convenient and timely manner all route planning, route monitoring and positioning performed on a paper chart? |
| 4.9 | 5 | How much would you say the RCDS reduced the navigational workload compared to using a paper chart? |
| 4.10 | < | Summary Evaluation: Considering all of your experience and the questions asked above, how would you score the following statement? |
| |) | "RCDS with adequate back-up arrangements used together with an appropriate folio of up-to-date paper charts may be accepted as complying with the chart carriage requirements of SOLAS." |

Make any other comments you feel are relevant to the use of RCDS as the primary means of navigation on the back of this page.